arXiv:1611.00879v1 [math-ph] 3 Nov 2016

Stable laws for chaotic billiards with cusps at flat points *

PAUL JUNG AND HONG-KUN ZHANG

Abstract

We consider billiards with a single cusp where the walls meeting at the vertex of the cusp have zero one-sided curvature, thus forming a flat point at the vertex. For Hölder continuous observables, we show that properly normalized Birkoff sums, with respect to the billiard map, converge in law to a totally skewed α-stable law.

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Stable convergence for the return time function **5**
2.1 Preliminary lemmas 6
2.2 Proof of Lemma 5 8
2.3 Poisson convergence for dependent arrays 10
2.4 Stable convergence for $\{(\mathcal{R} - \tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R})) \circ F^k\}$ 13

3 Stable convergence for induced functions **14**
3.1 Decay of correlations for induced functions 15
3.2 Stable convergence for $\{\tilde{f} \circ F^k\}$ 20

4 Proof of Theorem 1 **21**

5 Proof of Lemmas 4 and 15: calculating the scale parameter **23**

1 Introduction

Here we consider dispersing billiards with cusps at flat points. More precisely, for any $\beta > 2$, we consider a dispersing billiard table $Q = Q_\beta$ with a boundary consisting of a

*Received date: November 4, 2016

finite number of C^3 smooth curves Γ_i, $i = 1 \cdots, n_0$ with a cusp formed by two of those curves. To simplify things, we assume the table has only one cusp at $P = \Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2$; both Γ_1 and Γ_2 have zero derivatives up to $\beta - 1$ order at P, and the β-order derivative is not zero. Here $\beta > 2$ is a fixed constant. We choose a Cartesian coordinate system (s, z) originated at P, with the horizontal s-axis being the tangent line to both Γ_1 and Γ_2. Assume Γ_1 and Γ_2 can be represented as

$$z_1(s) = \beta^{-1} s^\beta, \quad z_1(s) = -\beta^{-1} s^\beta \tag{1.1}$$

for $s \in [0, \epsilon_0]$ with $\epsilon_0 > 0$ being a small fixed number.

We investigate a limit law for the billiard system on Q_β. To simplify our analysis, we denote Γ_3 as the opposition side to the cusp, and assume that the (unique) horizontal trajectory running out of the cusp from P will hit the boundary Γ_3 perpendicularly.

The billiard flow (Φ^t) is defined on the unit sphere bundle $Q \times \mathbf{S}^1$ and preserves Liouville measure. There is a natural cross section $\mathcal{M}$ in $Q \times \mathbf{S}^1$ that contains all post-collision vectors based at the boundary of the table ∂Q. The set $\mathcal{M} = \partial Q \times [0, \pi]$ is called the collision space. The corresponding billiard map $T : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}$ takes a vector $x \in \mathcal{M}$ to the next post-collision vector along the trajectory of x. Let the set S_0 consist of all grazing collision vectors with walls as well as all collision vectors at corner points. Then $\mathcal{S} := S_0 \cup T^{-1} S_0$ is called the *singular* set of T. The billiard map $T : \mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{M} \setminus T\,\mathcal{S}$ is a local C^2 diffeomorphism and preserves a natural absolutely continuous probability measure $d\mu = \frac{1}{2|\partial Q|} \sin\varphi \, dr \, d\varphi$ on the collision space $\mathcal{M}$ (here $|\partial Q|$ is the length of ∂Q).

Any post-collision vector $x \in \mathcal{M}$ can be represented by $x = (r, \varphi)$, where r is the arclength parameter along ∂Q, and $\varphi \in [0, \pi]$ is the angle formed by the tangent line of the boundary and the collision vector in the clockwise direction. For simplicity, we assume the cusp point has r-coordinate

$$r = r' \quad \text{and} \quad r = r'', \tag{1.2}$$

with respect to Γ_1 and Γ_2, respectively (we will also later set $r' = 0$). We define the subset $M \subset \mathcal{M}$, which consists of all collisions on $\partial Q \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2)$. We then define $F : M \to M$ (see (1.9) below) as the first return map, such that for any $x \in M$, $Fx \in M$ is the first return to M along the forward iterations of T. It is known that F preserves the measure

$$\tilde{\mu} := \frac{1}{\mu(M)} \mu|_M. \tag{1.3}$$

Rigorous bounds on the decay of correlations for billiards with flat points were derived recently in [Zha16], where a detailed description of billiards with flat points is

also given. It was shown that if f, g are Hölder continuous functions on the collision space $\mathcal{M}$, then for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\mu(f \circ T^n \cdot g) - \mu(f)\mu(g) = \mathcal{O}(n^{\frac{1}{1-\beta}}) \tag{1.4}$$

Here we use the standard notation $\mu(f) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} f \, d\mu$. It is the above slow decay of correlations that leads one to expect limiting behavior, which is different from the classical Central Limit Theorem, in the Birkhoff sums

$$\mathcal{S}_n f := f + f \circ T + \cdots + f \circ T^{n-1}$$

for Hölder continuous functions on $\mathcal{M}$. As usual, we consider the case $\mu(f) = 0$, where the general case follows by simply subtracting off $\mu(f)$.

Letting $\alpha = \frac{\beta}{\beta-1}$ (equivalently, $\beta = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}$), one can check that $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. Our main goal is to establish an α-stable limit theorem for the sequence $\{\mathcal{S}_n f, n \geq 0\}$. Indeed, a function f with $\mu(f) = 0$ is said to be in the domain of attraction of a (strictly) α-stable law if there exists $\{b_n\}$ such that $\{\frac{\mathcal{S}_n f}{b_n}\}$ converges in distribution to a random variable S_α with an α-stable law. Here, *strictly* simply means that $\mu(f) = 0$, and we shall henceforth just say α-stable. In particular, then there exists constants $C, C^- \geq 0$ such that the limiting stable law satisfies

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} x^\alpha \mathbf{P}(S_\alpha > x) = C, \quad \lim_{x\to\infty} x^\alpha \mathbf{P}(S_\alpha > x) = C^-. \tag{1.5}$$

If f is positive in a neighborhood of the vertex of the cusp P, then $C > 0$ and $C^- = 0$ (this holds under the weaker condition $I_f > 0$ defined in (1.7)), and the stable law is said to be *totally skewed*. We will consider only totally skewed stable laws in what follows (without loss of generality, positively skewed so that $C > 0, C^- = 0$).

The constant C above determines a so-called *scale parameter* $\sigma > 0$ which plays a role analogous to the standard deviation of a Gaussian distribution. In particular (see [ST94, p.17]),

$$\sigma^\alpha = C\,\Gamma(2-\alpha)\cos(\pi\alpha/2)(1-\alpha)^{-1}.$$

We will henceforth denote by $S_{\alpha,\sigma}$, a stable random variable with characteristic function

$$\mathbf{E}\left(e^{iuS_{\alpha,\sigma}}\right) = \exp\left(-|u\sigma|^\alpha \left(1 - i\text{sign}(u)\tan\frac{\pi\alpha}{2}\right)\right). \tag{1.6}$$

For any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we denote $\mathcal{H}_\gamma$ as the class of all Hölder continuous functions $f : \mathcal{M} \to \infty$, with Hölder exponent γ.

Theorem 1 (Stable limit theorem for billiards with cusps)**.** *Suppose* $\mu(f) = 0$ *and*

$$I_f = \frac{1}{4}\int_0^\pi (f(r', \varphi) + f(r'', \varphi)) \sin^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \varphi \, d\varphi \neq 0 \tag{1.7}$$

where r', r'' are as in (1.2)*. Let Q_β, where $\beta \in (2, \infty)$, be a billiard table with cusp defined by (1.1) and suppose $f \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Then as $n \to \infty$,*

$$\frac{\mathcal{S}_n f}{n^{1/\alpha}} \xrightarrow{d} S_{\alpha,\sigma_f} \tag{1.8}$$

with $\alpha = \frac{\beta}{\beta-1}$ and $\sigma_f^\alpha = \frac{2I_f^\alpha}{\beta|\partial Q|}$.

Remark: Since the map T is ergodic, the limit law (1.8) also holds, up to a change in σ, if we replace μ with any probability measure that is absolutely continuous with respect to μ. Also, the result extends easily to bounded, piecewise Hölder functions which are Hölder continuous in a neighborhood of the region in $\mathcal{M}$ corresponding to the cusp, and whose discontinuities are contained in the singular set of T.

A word on the method of proof of the above theorem. We follow a recently popular approach in studying the statistical properties of $(T, \mathcal{M})$, namely by using an inducing scheme as introduced in [Mar04, CZ05]. By removing spots with weak hyperbolicity from the phase space, one considers first the return map on the subspace $M \subset \mathcal{M}$. For any $x \in M$ we call

$$\mathcal{R}(x) := \min\{n \geq 1 : T^n(x) \in M\}$$

the *first return time function* and the *return map* $F\colon M \to M$ is defined by

$$F(x) := T^{\mathcal{R}(x)}(x), \quad \text{for all } x \in M. \tag{1.9}$$

The return map F preserves the conditional measure $\tilde{\mu}$, defined earlier. It was proved in [Zha16] that the induced system $(F, M, \tilde{\mu})$ is strongly (uniformly) hyperbolic and enjoys exponential decay of correlations– a property which aids tremendously in proving probabilistic limit theorems. The basic outline of the proof is that we first prove the stable limit theorem on M first for the special case of a centered version of the return time function using exponential decay of correlations on M. Next we show that a general *induced* function

$$\tilde{f}(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{\mathcal{R}(x)} f(T^k x), \quad x \in M, \tag{1.10}$$

can always be approximated by a return time function. Finally, we then extend this to the original space via an application of the Continuous Mapping Theorem. The proof uses techniques from both probability and chaotic billiards.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we prove convergence to a stable random variable for the partial sums of iterations of the return time function, which should be considered a special case of an induced function. In Section 3 we extend this result to general induced functions on M. In Section 4 we ultimately extend

this to convergence to α-stable laws for functions on the original space $\mathcal{M}$. In the last section, we provide technical calculations for the scale parameter σ. Throughout the proofs $C, C_1, C_2, \ldots$ denote positive constants that may change in different paragraphs.

2 Stable convergence for the return time function

In this section we prove convergence in distribution to a stable random variable for the normalized partial sums of iterations of the centered return time function. This is a special case of an induced function $\tilde{f} = \mathcal{R} - \tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R})$ for

$$f = 1 - \frac{1}{\mu(M)} \mathbf{1}_M$$

which satisfies $\mu(f) = 0$. Note that while f is not Hölder continuous, it is Hölder continuous on a neighborhood of the cusp, as well as piece-wise Hölder (see the remark following Theorem 1).

Denote the Birkhoff sums under the induced map by $S_n \tilde{f}$:

$$S_n \tilde{f} := \tilde{f} + \tilde{f} \circ F + \cdots + \tilde{f} \circ F^{n-1}$$

Note that $\mu(f) = 0$ implies $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}) = 0$ since

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\tilde{f}) &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \mu(f \cdot \mathbf{1}_{T^k M_m}) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mu(f \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\cup_{k=0}^{m-1} T^k M_m}) \\ &= \mu(f \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\cup_{m=1}^{\infty} \cup_{k=0}^{m-1} T^k M_m})) = \mu(f). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2 (Stable limits for the return time function)**.** *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be the first return time function on M. Then*

$$\frac{S_n(\mathcal{R} - \tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R}))}{\sqrt[\alpha]{n}} \xrightarrow{d} S_{\alpha, \tilde{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R}}} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\alpha} = \frac{2\bar{a}^{\alpha}}{\beta \mu(M) |\partial Q|}$ and $\bar{a} = \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \varphi \, d\varphi$.

In the rest of the section we prove the above Theorem 2, up to Lemmas 4 and 14 which require technical calculations. From a probabilistic viewpoint, the two properties that lead to such convergence are (a) the power law tails of the return time function and (b) the exponential decay of correlations for return time functions. Once these two properties are established, one obtains a purely probabilistic Poisson-type convergence (Subsection 2.3) which then leads to stable convergence. In the next subsection we state Lemmas 4 and 5 which give properties (a) and (b), but first we start with standard billiard estimates in Lemma 3 that will help us prove these two properties.

2.1 Preliminary lemmas

Billiards with cusps were previously studied in [CM07] and [Zha16], and the key analysis was a careful consideration of trajectories in the cusp which were called *corner series*. These trajectories play an important role here as well, and our first lemma below summarizes the key estimates concerning such trajectories, including an estimate which nearly gives us power law tails for the return times.

Let $(F, M, \tilde{\mu})$ be the induced system, with singularity set $\tilde{S}$. It easily follows from Kac's formula that $\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R}) = 1/\mu(M)$ which shows that $\mathcal{R}$ has finite mean. Our first important property states among other things, that furthermore, the return time function $\mathcal{R}$ satisfies the polynomial tail bound

$$\tilde{\mu}(x \in M : \mathcal{R}(x) > n) \sim n^{-\alpha}, \tag{2.2}$$

where $\alpha = 1 + \frac{1}{\beta - 1}$ is the constant of Theorem 1 ($a_n \sim b_n$ denotes $C_1 b_n < a_n < C_2 b_n$ for some constants $0 < C_1 < C_2 < \infty$). We will need even more precise estimates than this.

Let the domains

$$M_N := \{x \in M \,:\, \mathcal{R}(x) = N\}, \quad N \in \mathbb{N} \tag{2.3}$$

be called N-cells, consisting of points x whose forward trajectory enters the cusp and exits after exactly N-iterations. We denote $T^n x = (r_n, \varphi_n)$, for $n = 1, \cdots, N$. If $T^n x$ is sufficiently close to the vertex P of the cusp, then in (s, z)-coordinates, we denote s_n as the s-coordinate of the point $T^n x$. If we set $r' = 0$, one can check that on the side of the cusp corresponding to r',

$$s_n = r_n + \mathcal{O}(r_n^2). \tag{2.4}$$

On the side of the cusp corresponding to r'', similarly we have $s_n = r_n - r'' + \mathcal{O}(r_n^2)$, but by symmetry we will henceforth focus on the r'-side of the cusp. We have that $(1, s_n^{\beta-1})$ is a tangent vector of ∂Q at s_n, and

$$\rho_n := \tan^{-1}(s_n^{\beta-1})$$

is the angle of the tangent vector at s_n made with the horizontal axis, or equivalently, with the tangent line through the flat point P. We use notations similar to that of [Zha16], and define $\bar{N}$ by way of

$$\rho_{\bar{N}} := \min\{\rho_n \,:\, 1 \le n \le N\}.$$

It was argued in [CM07] that $|\bar{N} - N/2| \le 2$, so $\bar{N}$ is close to the middle of N. We further subdivide the corner series into three segments. Fix a small value $\bar{\varphi} > 0$ and let

$$N_1 = \max\{n \le \bar{N} \,:\, \varphi_n < \bar{\varphi}\}, \quad N_3 = \min\{n \ge \bar{N} \,:\, \varphi_n < \bar{\varphi}\},$$

and also put $N_2 = \bar{N}$. In previous works, the segment on $[1, N_1]$ was called the "entering period" in the corner series, the segment $[N_1 + 1; N_3 - 1]$ the "turning period", and the segment $[N_3, N]$ its "exiting period".

Lemma 3 (Trajectory and strip estimates, [Zha16])**.** *For any $N \geq 1$, points in the cell M_N have the following properties:*
(1) $N_1 \sim N_2 - N_1 \sim N_3 - N_2 \sim N - N_3 \sim N$. i.e. all the three segments in the corner series have length of order N;
(2) $\rho_1 \sim N^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}$, $\rho_n \sim n^{-1} \sim N^{-1}$, for $n \in [N_1, N_2]$;
(3) $\rho_n \sim n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} N^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}$, for $n \in [1, N_1]$;
(4) $\varphi_1 = \mathcal{O}(N^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}})$, $\varphi_2 \sim N^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}$;
(5) $\varphi_n \sim (nN^{-1})^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}$, for $n \in [1, N_1]$;
(6) M_N is a strip has width $\sim N^{-\frac{\alpha^2+\alpha+1}{\alpha+1}}$, length $\sim N^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}$, and density ~ 1.
(7) $\tilde{\mu}(M_N) \sim N^{-1-\alpha}$.

Note that part (7) above implies (2.2). In order to prove stable convergence, we will use Lemma 3 above to prove, in Section 5, a refinement of (2.2) which is given in the next lemma.

Lemma 4 (Power law return times)**.** *The return time function satisfies*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n\tilde{\mu}\left(x \in M : \mathcal{R}(x) > n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\right) = \frac{2\bar{a}^\alpha}{\beta\mu(M)|\partial Q|} \tag{2.5}$$

where $\bar{a} = \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \varphi \, d\varphi$.

Note that if $I_f = 2\bar{a}$ in Theorem 1, then the limit above is exactly σ^α.

Next we state the required decay of correlations for q-point marginals of the return time function. Fix an open interval $\mathcal{I}$. Our correlation bounds will depend on sets of the form

$$A_{n,j} := \{x \in M : \frac{1}{\sqrt[\alpha]{n}} \mathcal{R} \circ F^j \in \mathcal{I}^c\}.$$

Lemma 5 (Exponential decay of correlations for q-point marginals)**.** *For every $\mathcal{I}$, there is a constant $C > 0$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$\tilde{\mu}(A_{n,1} \cap \cdots \cap A_{n,q} \cap A_{n,q+k} \cap \cdots \cap A_{n,2q+k}) - \left(\tilde{\mu}_n(A_{n,1} \cap \cdots \cap A_{n,q})\right)^2 \leq C\theta^k. \tag{2.6}$$

for all $k, n, q \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $2q + k \leq n$. Also, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $1 \leq i < j \leq n$

$$\tilde{\mu}(A_{n,i}^c \cap A_{n,j}^c) \leq o\left(\frac{1}{n^{1+\varepsilon}}\right). \tag{2.7}$$

Since the indicator functions $\{\mathbf{1}_{A_{n,j}}\}$ are uniformly bounded by 1, the first part of this lemma was proved in [CZ09]– Theorem 4 there; the conditions for Theorem 4 of [CZ09] were checked in [Zha16]. Here we only need to prove (2.7). The proof of (2.7) will be given in Section 2.2 below.

2.2 Proof of Lemma 5

In this section we complete the proof of Lemma 5 by proving (2.7). We first review the concept of a standard pair and state a growth lemma. For an unstable curve W and a probability measure ν_0 on the Borel σ-algebra of W, we say that the pair (W, ν_0) is a *standard pair*, if ν_0 is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure restricted to the curve, m_W, and the density function $f(x) := d\nu_0/dm_W$ satisfies

$$|\ln f(x) - \ln f(y)| \le C d_W(x,y)^\gamma, \tag{2.8}$$

where $d_W(x,y)$ is the distance between x and y measured along the smooth curve W.

The notion of a standard pair was studied by Chernov and Dolgopyat in [CD09]. In particular, they considered families of standard pairs $\mathcal{G} = \{(W_\alpha, \nu_\alpha) : \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$ where $\mathcal{A} \subset [0,1]$. Let $\mathcal{W} = \{W_\alpha \,|\, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$. We call $\mathcal{G}$ a *standard family* if $\mathcal{W}$ is a measurable foliation of a measurable subset of M, and there exists a finite Borel measure $\lambda_\mathcal{G}$ on $\mathcal{A}$, which defines a measure ν on M by

$$\nu(B) := \int_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \nu_\alpha(B \cap W_\alpha)\, d\lambda_\mathcal{G}(\alpha) \tag{2.9}$$

for all measurable sets $B \subset M$. In the following, we denote a standard family by $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{W}, \nu)$.

For any unstable curve $W \in \mathcal{W}$, any $x \in W$, and any $n \ge 1$, let $W^k(x)$ be the smooth unstable curve in $F^k W$ that contains $F^k x$. Let

$$r_k(x) := \inf_{y\in\partial W^k} \{\text{dist}(F^k x, y), \ \text{ where } F^k x \in W^k(x) \subset F^k W\}.$$

According to the Growth Lemma (Lemma 9) in [Zha16], we know that an ϵ-neighborhood of the singular set of F has measure of order ϵ^q, with $q = \frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)}{\alpha^2+\alpha+1}$. We define the $\mathcal{Z}$ function of $\mathcal{G}$ as

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}) := \sup_{\epsilon>0} \frac{\nu(x : r_0(x) < \epsilon)}{\epsilon^q}$$

In addition, this implies that

$$\mathcal{Z}(F^n\mathcal{G}) = \sup_{\epsilon>0} \frac{F^n\nu(r_0(x) < \epsilon)}{\epsilon^q}$$

where

$$F^n\nu(r_0(x) < \epsilon) = \nu(F^{-n}(r_0 < \epsilon)) = \nu(r_n < \epsilon).$$

Thus we also have

$$\mathcal{Z}(F^n\mathcal{G}) = \sup_{\epsilon>0} \frac{\nu(r_n(x) < \epsilon)}{\epsilon^q}.$$

which also implies

$$\nu(r_k(x) < \epsilon) \le \epsilon^q \mathcal{Z}(F^k\mathcal{G}). \tag{2.10}$$

The following growth lemma was proved in [CZ09, Lemma 6] for standard families.

Lemma 6 (Growth lemma)**.** *Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{W}, \nu)$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\nu(r_k(x) < \epsilon) < \epsilon^q \mathcal{Z}(F^k\mathcal{G}) \le C_1(\vartheta^{k-1}\mathcal{Z}(F\mathcal{G}) + C_2)\epsilon^q$$

where $C_1 > 0, C_2 > 0$ and $\vartheta \in (0,1)$ are constants.

Denote for $a > 0$

$$\mathcal{W}_a := \cup_{m=[an^{1/\alpha}]}^{\infty} M_m.$$

For any set M_m in $\mathcal{W}_a$, we foliate it into unstable curves that stretch completely from one side to the other. Then by introducing a factor measure on the index of these curves, we define a standard family, denoted as $\mathcal{G}_a = (\mathcal{W}_a, \nu_a)$, with $\nu_a := \tilde{\mu}|_{\mathcal{W}_a}/\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{W}_a)$. One can check that $\mathcal{G}_a$ is a standard family. According to Lemma 3, FM_m is a strip that has length $\sim m^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}$, width $\sim m^{-\frac{\alpha^2+\alpha+1}{\alpha+1}}$, and density approximately 1. Using the width and density we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Z}(F\mathcal{G}_a) &= \sup_{\epsilon>0} \frac{\nu_a(r_1(x) < \epsilon)}{\epsilon^q} \\
&\le C\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{W}_a)^{-1} \cdot \sum_{m=an^{1/\alpha}}^{\infty} m^{-\frac{\alpha^2+\alpha+1}{\alpha+1}} \\
&\le C_0 n \left(\frac{a}{n}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore Lemma 6 implies that

$$\nu_a(r_k(x) < \epsilon) \le C_1(\vartheta^{k-1}\mathcal{Z}(F\mathcal{G}_a) + C_2)\epsilon^q \le C_3(\vartheta^{k-1}n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} + C_2)\epsilon^q$$

which by the definition of ν_a is equivalent to

$$\tilde{\mu}((r_k(x) < \epsilon) \cap \mathcal{W}_a) \le C_3\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{W}_a)(\vartheta^{k-1}n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} + C_2)\epsilon^q. \tag{2.11}$$

Next, we use properties of standard families to prove (2.7). For any $b > 0$, we know that unstable curves in $\mathcal{W}_b$ have width less than $\epsilon = C_4 n^{-\frac{\alpha^2+\alpha+1}{\alpha(\alpha+1)}}$. Thus

$$\mathcal{W}_b \subset \{x : r_0(x) < C_4 n^{-\frac{\alpha^2+\alpha+1}{\alpha(\alpha+1)}}\}$$

which implies that

$$\epsilon^q = (C_4 n^{-\frac{\alpha^2+\alpha+1}{\alpha(\alpha+1)}})^{\frac{(\alpha+1)\alpha}{\alpha^2+\alpha+1}} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}).$$

Moreover, (2.11) now gives us

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mu}(F^{-k}\mathcal{W}_b \cap \mathcal{W}_a) &\leq \tilde{\mu}((r_k(x) < \epsilon) \cap \mathcal{W}_a) \\ &\leq C_3\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{W}_a)(\vartheta^{k-1}n^{\frac{1}{\alpha+1}} + C_2)n^{-1} \\ &\leq C_5\vartheta^{k-1}n^{-\frac{2\alpha+1}{\alpha+1}} + C_6 n^{-2} \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

which proves (2.7).

2.3 Poisson convergence for dependent arrays

Poisson convergence is the main probabilistic apparatus that allows one to prove convergence to a stable law. Here we state a Poisson convergence result which is a variant of [Adl78, Thm 4.1] (see also [LLR83, Thm 5.7.1]). Specifically, it concerns the convergence, to empirical Poisson point processes, of empirical measures corresponding to stationary triangular arrays of random variables.

It is often useful to think of empirical point processes as integer-valued random measures. Recall that a Poisson random measure or Poisson point process $N(d\lambda)$ with intensity measure $d\lambda$ (also called the mean measure or control measure) is an independently scattered random measure satisfying, for all Borel sets B, $N(\lambda(B)) \overset{d}{\sim}$ Poiss$(\lambda(B))$ so that

$$\mathbf{P}(N(\lambda(B)) = k) = e^{-\lambda(B)}\frac{\lambda(B)^k}{k!}.$$

We start with a lemma due to [Kal73].

Lemma 7 (Poisson random measure characterization)**.** *Suppose (ν_n) is a sequence of random empirical measures on $\mathbb{R}^+$ and that $N(d\lambda)$ is a Poisson random measure on $\mathbb{R}^+$. If for any open interval $\mathcal{I}$ with $\lambda(\mathcal{I}) < \infty$*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{P}(\nu_n(\mathcal{I}) = 0) = \exp(-\lambda(\mathcal{I})) \tag{2.13}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}\nu_n(\mathcal{I}) = \lambda(\mathcal{I}), \tag{2.14}$$

then we have the convergence in distribution $\nu_n \Rightarrow N(d\lambda)$ under the vague topology on measures (which makes the space of measures a Polish space).

Proposition 8 (Poisson convergence for dependent arrays)**.** *Suppose*

$$\{X_{n,j} : n \geq 1, j = 1, \cdots, n\}$$

is a triangular array of positive random variables such that each row is stationary, and suppose that for some absolutely continuous measure λ on $\mathbb{R}^+$,

$$n\mathbf{P}(X_{n,1} \in \mathcal{I}) \overset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \lambda(\mathcal{I}), \quad \textit{for any open interval } \mathcal{I} \subset \mathbb{R}^+. \tag{2.15}$$

Also suppose that for $1 \le i < j \le n$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}(X_{n,i} \in \mathcal{I}, X_{n,j} \in \mathcal{I}) = o\left(\frac{1}{n^{1+\varepsilon}}\right), \tag{2.16}$$

for some $\theta \in (0,1)$. Finally, suppose that for every open interval $\mathcal{I}$, there exists $\theta \in (0,1)$ and some constant $C > 0$ such that for all $k, n, q \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $2q + k \le n$,

$$\left|\mathbf{P}(X_{n,1} \in \mathcal{I}^c, \ldots, X_{n,q} \in \mathcal{I}^c, X_{n,q+k} \in \mathcal{I}^c, \ldots, X_{n,2q+k} \in \mathcal{I}^c) - (\mathbf{P}(X_{n,1} \in \mathcal{I}^c, \ldots, X_{n,q} \in \mathcal{I}^c))^2\right| \le C\theta^k. \tag{2.17}$$

Then we have the following weak convergence of random empirical measures under the vague topology:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \delta_{X_{n,j}} \Rightarrow N(d\lambda).$$

Since the intensity measure $d\lambda$ is absolutely continuous, the vague convergence of random empirical measures above is equivalent to showing that for every interval $(a,b) \subset \mathbb{R}^+$, the cardinality of $\{j : a < X_{n,j} < b, 1 \le j \le n\}$ converges in distribution as $n \to \infty$ to a Poisson distribution with parameter $\lambda((a,b))$. We will use this formulation in the proof below.

We remark that conditions (2.16) and (2.17) are analogous to the standard conditions $D'(u_n)$ and $D_r(\mathbf{u}_n)$, respectively, in [LLR83]. These are certainly not the weakest conditions possible, but are tailored to the situation at hand.

Proof. It is enough to verify (2.13) and (2.14). Fix an open interval $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\lambda(\mathcal{I}) < \infty$. Since each row of the triangular array is stationary, (2.14) follows directly from (2.15). So we will concentrate on verifying (2.13).

Condition (2.13) would follow if the random variables in each row were independent since then we would have

$$\mathbf{P}(\nu_n(\mathcal{I}) = 0) = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{P}(X_{n,j} \notin \mathcal{I}) \approx \left(1 - \frac{\lambda(\mathcal{I})}{n}\right)^n.$$

We do not have independence, but assumptions (2.16) and (2.17) imply asymptotic independence which controls the dependence between $X_{n,1}, \cdots, X_{n,n}$. This will done via Bernstein's classical small-large block method [Ber27]; see also [IL71, Ch. 18]. More precisely, choose

$$0 < a < b < \varepsilon,$$

where ε is as in (2.16), and for any $n \geq 1$, divide $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ into a sequence of pairs of alternating big intervals (blocks) of length $[n^b]$ and small blocks of length $[n^a]$. The number of pairs of big and small blocks is $B = [n/([n^a] + [n^b])]$ so that $\lim_{n\to\infty} B/n^{1-b} = 1$. There may be a leftover partial block L in the end which is is negligible since

$$\sum_{j\in L} \mathbf{P}(X_{n,j} \in \mathcal{I}) \leq \frac{Cn^b}{n}.$$

Thus we may henceforth assume $n = ([n^a] + [n^b])B$.

We denote by $\mathcal{B}_k$ and $\mathcal{S}_k$ for $k = 1, \cdots, B$, the elements of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ in big blocks and small blocks, respectively. Let

$$Y_{n,k} = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{B}_k} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{n,j}\in\mathcal{I}\}}, \quad Z_{n,k} = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{S}_k} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{n,j}\in\mathcal{I}\}}.$$

For each n, both $\{Y_{n,k}\}$ and $\{Z_{n,k}\}$ are sequences of identically distributed random variables. Let $S'_n = \sum_{k=1}^B Y_{n,k}$ and $S''_n = \sum_{k=1}^B Z_{n,k}$.

Similar to the argument for L, we have

$$\mathbf{E}S''_n \leq C\frac{Bn^a}{n} \leq C\frac{1}{n^{b-a}}$$

so that we can ignore small blocks. Thus, it is enough to show that $\mathbf{P}(S'_n = 0)$ converges to $\exp(-\lambda(\mathcal{I}))$. Since big blocks are separated by small blocks, we can peel off one factor at a time in the product $\prod \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_{n,k}=0\}}$ so that using (2.17) multiple times implies

$$\mathbf{P}(S'_n = 0) = (\mathbf{P}(Y_{n,1} = 0))^B + \mathcal{O}(\theta^{n^a}) \tag{2.18}$$

for some $0 < \theta < 1$. It remains to estimate $\mathbf{P}(Y_{n,1} = 0)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}(Y_{n,1} = 0) &\leq 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n^b} \left(\mathbf{P}(X_{n,j} \in \mathcal{I}) - \sum_{k=j+1}^{n^b} \mathbf{P}(\{X_{n,j} \in \mathcal{I}\} \cap \{X_{n,k} \in \mathcal{I}\}) \right) \\
&\leq 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n^b} \left(\mathbf{P}(X_{n,j} \in \mathcal{I}) - o\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \right) \\
&\leq 1 - n^b \mathbf{P}(X_{n,j} \in \mathcal{I}) + n^b o\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the second to last inequality follows from (2.16) since $b < \varepsilon$. An even easier lower bound is given by

$$\mathbf{P}(Y_{n,1} = 0) \geq 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n^b} \mathbf{P}(X_{n,j} \in \mathcal{I}).$$

Putting things together we have

$$\mathbf{P}(S'_n = 0) = \big(1 - [n^b]\mathbf{P}(X_{n,1} \in \mathcal{I}) + o(n^{b-1})\big)^B + \mathcal{O}(\theta^{n^a})$$

which is what we need since $B/n^{1-b} \to 1$ and $n\mathbf{P}(X_{n,1} \in \mathcal{I}) \to \lambda(\mathcal{I})$. □

2.4 Stable convergence for $\{(\mathcal{R} - \tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R})) \circ F^k\}$

Here we prove Theorem 2 by applying Proposition 8 to the (uncentered) triangular array defined by

$$X_{n,k} := \frac{1}{\sqrt[\alpha]{n}} \mathcal{R} \circ F^k \tag{2.19}$$

for $n \geq 1$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$. One can easily check that $\{X_{n,k}, k = 1, \cdots, n\}$ is a stationary sequence. The other conditions of Proposition 8 are verified by Lemmas 4 and 5.

Let

$$\lambda(dx) := \frac{\alpha \tilde{\sigma}^\alpha_{\mathcal{R}} dx}{x^{1+\alpha}} \tag{2.20}$$

where

$$\tilde{\sigma}^\alpha_{\mathcal{R}} := \frac{2\bar{a}^\alpha}{\beta\mu(M)|\partial Q|},$$

with $\bar{a} = \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \varphi \, d\varphi$, is as in Lemma 4. In particular, Lemma 4 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n\to\infty} n\mathbf{P}(X_{n,0} \geq x n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}) &= \frac{\bar{a} x^{-\alpha}}{\beta\mu(M)|\partial Q|} \\ &= \lambda([x, +\infty)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the random measures

$$\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{X_{n,k}}, n \in \mathbb{N} \right) \tag{2.21}$$

converge weakly, in the vague topology, to the Poisson random measure with intensity measure $\lambda(dx)$ given in (2.20).

Next, for any $\delta > 0$, this implies that the sum of the uncentered terms, $\sum_{k=1}^n X_{n,k} \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{n,k} > \delta\}}$ converges, as $n \to \infty$, to a compound Poisson distribution. This follows from [Kal02, Lemma 12.2] by simply integrating the identity function $g(x) = x$ over the random measures in (2.21), and then taking the limit as $n \to \infty$. In particular, we obtain the compound Poisson distribution whose characteristic function has Lévy exponent

$$\tilde{\sigma}^\alpha_{\mathcal{R}} \int_\delta^\infty (e^{itx} - 1)\alpha x^{-1-\alpha} \, dx. \tag{2.22}$$

This also implies that the sum of the centered terms $\sum_{k=1}^{n}(X_{n,k}\mathbf{1}_{\{X_{n,k}>\delta\}}-\mathbf{E}X_{n,1}\mathbf{1}_{\{X_{n,k}>\delta\}})$ converge to a distribution with Lévy exponent

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\alpha}\int_{\delta}^{\infty}\alpha\frac{e^{itx}-1-itx}{x^{1+\alpha}}\,dx. \tag{2.23}$$

Taking the limit as $\delta\to 0$ for the centered sums with characteristic Lévy exponent given in (2.23), now proves Theorem 2 since we will see below in Lemma 14 that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\sum_{k=1}^{n}X_{n,k}\mathbf{1}_{\{X_{n,k}\leq\delta\}}$$

converges in probability to zero as $\delta\to 0$.

Let us remark that it is important to take the limit $\delta\to 0$ in (2.23) rather than in the uncentered sum whose characteristic function is described in (2.22), since only (2.23) converges as $\delta\to 0$ (see [Dur10, Sec 3.7]or [Kal02, Ch. 13] for a thorough discussion).

Let us also note here that $\bar{a}=I_f$ in the special case $f=1-\frac{1}{\mu(M)}\mathbf{1}_M$.

3 Stable convergence for induced functions

In this section we extend the results of the previous section to general induced functions on the space M. Recall that

$$I_f=\frac{1}{4}\int_0^{\pi}(f(r',\varphi)+f(r'',\varphi))\sin^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\varphi\,d\varphi$$

where r',r'' are as in (1.2).

Theorem 9 (Stable limit theorem for the induced map)**.** *Suppose $I_f\neq 0$. Let $f:\mathcal{M}\to\mathbb{R}$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1 and let $\tilde{f}$ be the induced function on M constructed by (1.10). Then*

$$\frac{S_n\tilde{f}}{\sqrt[\alpha]{n}}\xrightarrow{d}S_{\alpha,\tilde{\sigma}_f} \tag{3.1}$$

where $\alpha=\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_f^{\alpha}=\frac{2I_f^{\alpha}}{\beta\mu(M)|\partial Q|}$.

The idea of the proof is to write a general induced function as

$$\tilde{f}(x)=C\left(\mathcal{R}(x)-\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R})\right)+E(x)$$

where C is a constant and $E(x)$ is an "error" function which vanishes in the renormalized limit of Birkhoff sums $n^{-1/\alpha}S_n\tilde{f}$. In order to show that $E(x)$ is inconsequential we will need a decay of correlations result for $\tilde{f}$ which is much easier to prove if $\tilde{f}$ is bounded (for each n). We therefore start this section by truncating both the high and

low portions of $\tilde{f}$. Let us remark that the high truncation presented here is not needed for the proof for the case of the return time function since the proof of decay of correlations in Lemma 5 did not require a high truncation. On the other hand, the low truncation corresponds to the δ truncation used in (2.22) in the proof for the return time function; one consequence of the decay of correlations proved in this section is to show that this truncation has no effect in the scaling limit.

Fix a small $\delta > 0$, and split M according to the low, intermediate, and high regions of the index m for the sets $\{\mathcal{R}(x) = m\}$:

$$M^L := \cup_{m<\delta n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} M_m, \qquad M^I := \cup_{\delta n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \le m < \frac{1}{\delta} n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} M_m \quad \text{and} \quad M^H := \cup_{m \ge \frac{1}{\delta} n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} M_m \tag{3.2}$$

which all depend implicitly on n and δ. For a fixed small δ,

$$\tilde{\mu}(M^L) \sim 1, \quad \tilde{\mu}(M^I) \sim \frac{1}{\delta^\alpha n}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mu}(M^H) \sim \frac{\delta^\alpha}{n},$$

where the δ^α is irrelevant at this point since the relation $\sim$ is up to a constant as $n \to \infty$. Nevertheless we have written the factor of δ^α since we will eventually send $\delta \to 0$ (after we compare quantities which have equivalent asymptotics as $n \to \infty$). We also put

$$\tilde{f}_L := \tilde{f}|_{M^L}, \quad \tilde{f}_I := \tilde{f}|_{M^I} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{f}_H := \tilde{f}|_{M^H} \tag{3.3}$$

so that $\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}_L + \tilde{f}_I + \tilde{f}_H$. Note that the mean $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}) = 0$ does not imply that the truncated means are also zero, but typically we can just subtract off the truncated means, without loss of generality in the proofs.

3.1 Decay of correlations for induced functions

Fix $\delta > 0$ and let $\mathcal{W}_{i,j} = \cup_{m=i}^{j} M_m$ be the union of cells with indices satisfying $i \le j \le \frac{1}{\delta} n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ so that $\mathcal{W}_{i,j} \subset M^L \cup M^I$. Note that the viable range of i and j depends on n and δ. Denote $\tilde{f}_{i,j} := \tilde{f} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{M_{i,j}}$.

Proposition 10 (Exponential decay of correlations for $\mathbf{E}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}|\mathcal{R})$)**.** *Suppose $\tilde{f}$ is measurable with respect to the σ-algebra generated by $\mathcal{R}$, and that $0 \le i \le j \le \frac{1}{\delta} n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$. There is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all k sufficiently large,*

$$|\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_{i,j} \circ F^k \cdot \tilde{f}_{i,j}) - \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_{i,j})^2| \le o(n^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1-\epsilon})\theta^k. \tag{3.4}$$

where $\theta \in (0,1)$ is a constant, and $o(\cdot)$ is as $n \to \infty$.

We can split f into its positive and negative parts and prove the proposition for each part separately. Thus for the rest of the subsection we assume without loss of generality that $\tilde{f} > 0$ which is induced by some $f > 0$.

We need the following extension of Lemma 6 which was proved in [CZ09, Theorem 2]. We set some large constant $C_q > 0$ and call any standard family $\mathcal{G}$ satisfying $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{G}) < C_q$, a *proper* family (refer to Lemma 6 for notation).

Lemma 11 (Growth lemma and equidistribution)**.** *Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{W}, \nu)$ be a standard family. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\nu(r_n(x) < \epsilon) < \epsilon^q \mathcal{Z}(F^n \mathcal{G}) \leq C_1(\theta^{n-1}\mathcal{Z}(F\mathcal{G}) + C_2)\epsilon^q$$

where $C_1 > 0, C_2 > 0$ and $\theta \in (0,1)$ are constants. Moreover, if $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{W}, \nu)$ is a proper family, then for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_\gamma$, with $\gamma \in (0,1)$,

$$|F^m \nu(g) - \tilde{\mu}(g)| \leq C(\|g\|_\gamma + \|g\|_\infty)\theta^m \tag{3.5}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_\gamma$ is the Hölder norm.

For any set M_m in $\mathcal{W}_{i,j}$, we foliate it into unstable curves that stretch completely from one side to the other. Then by introducing a factor measure on the index of these curves, we define a standard family, denoted as $\mathcal{G}_{i,j} = (\mathcal{W}_{i,j}, \nu_{i,j})$, with

$$d\nu_{i,j}(x) := h_{i,j} d\tilde{\mu}(x)/\tilde{\mu}(h_{i,j}) \tag{3.6}$$

and $h_{i,j} \sim \mathcal{R}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{W}_{i,j}}$.

Our first step in proving the decay of correlations is to show that there is a k such that $F^k\mathcal{G}_{i,j}$ is a proper family for a certain $\nu_{i,j}$. According to Lemma 3, FM_m is a strip that has length $\sim m^{-\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}$ and width $\sim m^{-\frac{\alpha^2+\alpha+1}{\alpha+1}}$. Also, by construction, the density of $\nu_{i,j}$ is of order m on FM_m. Thus we obtain for $j < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Z}(F\mathcal{G}_{i,j}) &= \sup_{\epsilon>0} \frac{\nu_{i,j}(r_1(x) < \epsilon)}{\epsilon^q} \\
&\leq C\|f\|_\infty \tilde{\mu}(h_{i,j})^{-1} \cdot \sum_{m=i}^{j} m \cdot m^{-\frac{\alpha^2+\alpha+1}{\alpha+1}} \\
&= C\|f\|_\infty \tilde{\mu}(h_{i,j})^{-1} \cdot \sum_{m=i}^{j} m^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha+1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that if $h_{i,j} = \tilde{f}_{i,j}$, then

$$\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}) = \sum_{m=i}^{j} \mu(\tilde{f} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{M_m}) \sim \sum_{m=i}^{j} m \cdot \tilde{\mu}(\mathbf{1}_{M_m}) \sim i^{1-\alpha} \geq j^{1-\alpha}.$$

Using the inequality $\mathcal{Z}(F^k\mathcal{G}_{i,j}) \leq C_1(\theta^{k-1}\mathcal{Z}(F\mathcal{G}_{i,j}) + C_2)$ from Lemma 11, we have that for some $C_3 > 0$, there exists

$$N(j) \geq C_3 \ln j$$

such that for any $k \geq N(j)$, the family $F^k\mathcal{G}_{i,j}$ is a proper family.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the σ-algebra generated by $\mathcal{R}$. The next ingredient in the proof of Proposition 10 is the following lemma concerning conditional expectations with respect to the probability measure $\tilde{\mu}$,

$$\mathcal{E}_f(x) \equiv \mathcal{E}_f^{(0)}(x) := \mathbf{E}(\tilde{f} \circ F|\mathcal{F})(x),$$

and recursively for $k \geq 1$

$$\mathcal{E}_f^{(k)}(x) := \mathbf{E}(\mathcal{E}_f^{(k-1)} \circ F|\mathcal{F})(x). \tag{3.7}$$

Lemma 12 (Flattening conditional expectations)**.** *For any $\zeta \in (0,1)$, there is a constant $C_{\zeta,k} > 0$, such that for k large enough,*

$$\mathcal{E}_f^{(k)} \leq C_{\zeta,k}\|f\|_\infty \mathcal{R}(x)^\zeta.$$

To prove the above lemma we will use the following results proved in [Zha16] (noting that if $\beta = \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ then $\alpha = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$).

Lemma 13 (Transition probabilities and conditional expectation bounds)**.** *There exist positive constants $C_1 < C_2$, not depending on n, such that:*
(1) For $n \geq 1$, if $M_m \cap FM_n \neq \emptyset$ then m lies in

$$\mathcal{I}_n := [C_1 n^{1/\alpha}, C_2 n^\alpha]. \tag{3.8}$$

(2) For $m \in \mathcal{I}_n$, the transition probability satisfies

$$\mu(M_m|F(M_n)) \sim m^{-\frac{\alpha^2+\alpha+1}{\alpha+1}} n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}.$$

(3) Let $\alpha_0 = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$, then $\mathbf{E}(\mathcal{R} \circ F|M_n)(x) = e_n \mathbf{1}_{M_n}(x)$ for some $e_n \leq Cn^\xi$, where $C > 0$ and

$$\xi = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha}, & \alpha > \alpha_0 \\ \frac{1}{\alpha} + \epsilon_0, & \alpha = \alpha_0 \\ \alpha(2-\alpha), & 1 < \alpha < \alpha_0 \end{cases}$$

for all $\epsilon_0 > 0$ sufficiently small.

Proof of Lemma 12. By part (3) of Lemma 13, there is a sequence (e_n) such that

$$\mathbf{E}(\mathcal{R} \circ F|\mathcal{F})(x) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty e_n \mathbf{1}_{M_n}(x) = \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{R}^\xi(x))$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty e_{f,n} \mathbf{1}_{M_n}(x)$$

with

$$e_{f,n} \leq \|f\|_\infty e_n \sim \|f\|_\infty n^\xi.$$

By parts (1) and (2) of that same lemma

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_f^{(1)}\mathbf{1}_{M_n} &\sim \|f\|_\infty \sum_{m\in\mathcal{I}_n} m^\xi \cdot \mu(M_m|FM_n)\cdot \mathbf{1}_{M_n} \\ &\sim \|f\|_\infty \sum_{m\in\mathcal{I}_n} m^{\xi-1-\frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha+1}} \cdot n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{M_n}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

The proof of the lemma is broken up into three cases according to the value of ξ in Lemma 13.

The easiest case is when $\alpha > \alpha_0$ in which case $\xi = \frac{1}{\alpha} < \frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha+1}$. Thus by (3.9),

$$\mathcal{E}_f^{(1)}\mathbf{1}_{M_n} \sim \frac{n^{\frac{\xi}{\alpha}+\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}}{n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}}\cdot \mathbf{1}_{M_n} = n^{\frac{\xi}{\alpha}}\cdot \mathbf{1}_{M_n}.$$

Set $\xi_0 = \xi = 1/\alpha$ and recursively define

$$\xi_{k+1} = \frac{1}{\alpha}\left(\xi_k - \frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha+1}\right) + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1} = \xi_k/\alpha \tag{3.10}$$

so that $\xi_k = 1/\alpha^{k+1}$. One can use induction on the argument in (3.9) to get that for all $k \geq 1$, the conditional expectation $\mathcal{E}_f^{(k)}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_f^{(k)}\mathbf{1}_{M_n} = \mathbf{E}(\mathcal{E}_f^{(k-1)}\circ F|M_n) &\sim \|f\|_\infty \sum_{m\in\mathcal{I}_n} m^{\xi_{k-1}-1-\frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha+1}} \cdot n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{M_n} \\ &\sim n^{\xi_k}\mathbf{1}_{M_n}.\end{aligned}$$

For the case where $\alpha = \alpha_0$, choose $\epsilon_0 < \frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha+1} - \frac{1}{\alpha}$. Then, the argument is the same as the case $\alpha > \alpha_0$ except that we start the recursion at $\xi_0 = \xi = \frac{1}{\alpha} + \epsilon_0$ so that $\xi_k = \frac{1}{\alpha^{k+1}} + \frac{\epsilon_0}{\alpha^k}$.

The hardest case is where $\alpha \in (1, \alpha_0)$ and $\xi = \alpha(2-\alpha)$. By (3.9) we have

$$\mathcal{E}_f^{(1)}\mathbf{1}_{M_n} \sim n^{\alpha(\xi-\frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha+1})+\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}}\mathbf{1}_{M_n} = n^{-\alpha^3+\alpha^2+\alpha}\mathbf{1}_{M_n}.$$

Set $\xi_0 = \xi = \alpha(2-\alpha)$ and using a slightly different recursion, define

$$\xi_{k+1} = \alpha\left(\xi_k - \frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha+1}\right) + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1} = \alpha\xi_k - \alpha(\alpha-1). \tag{3.11}$$

This also implies that

$$\alpha - \xi_{k+1} = \alpha^k(\alpha - \xi_k) = \alpha^{k+1}(\alpha-1)$$

It implies that $\xi_k < \alpha$, and $\{\xi_k\}$ is a a strictly decreasing sequence.

For any fixed α, we define

$$k_\alpha = \min\left\{k : \xi_k \le \frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha+1}\right\}.$$

One can check by induction that for all $k \in [1, k_\alpha)$, we have $\mathcal{E}_f^{(k)}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_f^{(k)}\mathbf{1}_{M_n} &\sim \|f\|_\infty \sum_{m\in\mathcal{I}_n} m^{\xi_{k-1}-1-\frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha+1}} \cdot n^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+1}} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{M_n} \\ &\sim n^{\xi_k}\mathbf{1}_{M_n}.\end{aligned}$$

If $\xi_{k_\alpha} < \frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha+1}$, then starting from the k_αth step of the recursion, we use (3.10) instead of (3.11). If $\xi_{k_\alpha} = \frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha+1}$, then we simply have to deal with an extra logarithmic factor. □

Proof of Proposition 10. For $i \le j$, we apply Lemma 12 to

$$\mathbf{E}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}\circ F|\mathcal{F})(x) = \mathcal{E}_{f,i,j}(x) := \sum_{n=i}^{j} e_{f,n}\mathbf{1}_{M_n}(x) \tag{3.12}$$

where we also define $\mathcal{E}_{f,i,j}^{(k)}$ using (3.7). One can check that $\mathbf{E}(\mathcal{E}_{f,i,j}^{(k-1)}|\mathcal{F}) = \mathbf{E}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}\circ F^k|\mathcal{F})$, and if $h_{i,j}\in\mathcal{F}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}\circ F^k\cdot h_{i,j}) &= \tilde{\mu}(\mathbf{E}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}\circ F^k\cdot h_{i,j}|\mathcal{F})) \\ &= \tilde{\mu}(\mathbf{E}(\mathcal{E}_{f,i,j}^{(k-1)}|\mathcal{F})\cdot h_{i,j}) = \tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{E}_{f,i,j}^{(k)}\cdot h_{i,j}).\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Letting $h_{i,j} = \mathbf{E}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}|\mathcal{F})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}\circ F^m\cdot\mathbf{E}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}|\mathcal{F})) - \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_{i,j})^2 &= \tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{E}_{f,i,j}^{(m)}\cdot\mathbf{E}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}|\mathcal{F})) - \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_{i,j})^2 \\ &= \tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{E}_{f,i,j}^{(k)}\cdot\mathbf{E}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}|\mathcal{F})\circ F^{k-m}) - \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_{i,j})^2 \\ &= F^{m-k}\nu_{i,j}(\mathcal{E}_{f,i,j}^{(k)})\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{E}_{f,i,j}) - \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_{i,j})\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{E}_{f,i,j}).\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

where $\nu_{i,j}$ is as in (3.6) with a density proportional to $h_{i,j} = \mathbf{E}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}|\mathcal{F})$. We then have by (3.5), for any $m > k + N(j)$ and for $j < \infty$,

$$|\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}\circ F^m\cdot\mathbf{E}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}|\mathcal{F})) - \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_{i,j})^2| \le C(\|\mathcal{E}_{f,i,j}^{(k)}\|_\infty + \|\mathcal{E}_{f,i,j}^{(k)}\|_\gamma)\theta^{m-k-N(j)}.$$

In particular, if k is large enough to satisfy Lemma 12 for $\zeta < 2-\alpha-\alpha\epsilon$ and $j \sim n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ we have

$$|\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}\circ F^m\cdot\mathbf{E}(\tilde{f}_{i,j}|\mathcal{F})) - \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_{i,j})^2| = o(n^{\frac{2-\alpha}{\alpha}-\epsilon})\theta^{m-k-N(j)}.$$

The proposition is now proved if $\tilde{f}_{i,j}$ is $\mathcal{F}$-measurable. □

3.2 Stable convergence for $\{\tilde{f} \circ F^k\}$

Our next lemma says that $\tilde{f}$ is essentially determined by $\tilde{f}_I$.

Lemma 14 (Vanishing of truncated portions)**.** *Let $\tilde{f}$ be induced by a Hölder continuous $f \in L_\infty(\mathcal{M}, \mu)$. Noting that $\tilde{f}_L$ and $\tilde{f}_H$ implicitly depend on δ and n, we have*

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{S_n \tilde{f}_L}{n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{S_n \tilde{f}_H}{n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} = 0$$

in probability, uniformly in n.

Proof. Let us start with the easier assertion for $\tilde{f}_H$. By Lemma 3 part (7), $\tilde{\mu}(M^H) \leq C\delta^\alpha/n$ so that

$$\tilde{\mu}(\{x : |\tilde{f}_H \circ F^m| \geq \delta^{-1} n^{1/\alpha} \text{ for some } m \leq n\}) \leq C\delta^\alpha, \tag{3.15}$$

which implies the claim for $\tilde{f}_H$.

Concerning the lower truncation, note that

$$\tilde{\mu}\left(n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} S_n \tilde{f}_L\right)^2 \leq \tilde{\mu}\left(\frac{\|f\|_\infty}{n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} S_n \mathcal{R}_L\right)^2.$$

where $\mathcal{R}_L$ is $\mathcal{R}$ truncated according to (3.3). By Lemma 3 part (7),

$$\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R}_L)^2 \leq C \sum_{k=1}^{\delta n^{1/\alpha}} k^2 k^{-1-\alpha} \leq C\delta^{2-\alpha} n^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1}.$$

Moreover, by Proposition 10, we have that for $k \geq 1$,

$$\text{Cov}(\mathcal{R}_L, \mathcal{R}_L \circ F^k) \leq o(n^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1-\epsilon})\theta^k.$$

Thus, for all n,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(S_n \mathcal{R}_L) &\leq 2 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (n-k) \text{Cov}(\mathcal{R}_L, \mathcal{R}_L \circ F^k) \\ &\leq C\delta^{2-\alpha} n^{\frac{2}{\alpha}} \end{aligned}$$

Thus the variance of $n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} S_n \mathcal{R}_L$ is bounded, and taking $\delta \to 0$ proves the claim. □

It is thus enough to show that $n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \left(S_n \tilde{f}_I - n\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_I)\right)$ converges in distribution to our desired stable law as, firstly, $n \to \infty$ and then, secondly, $\delta \to 0$. We assume that $\mu(f_I) = 0$ so that in particular $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_I) = 0$. Let $\mathcal{R}_I := \mathcal{R}|_{M^I}$ and write $\tilde{f}_I$ as:

$$\tilde{f}_I = \frac{I_f}{2\bar{a}} \left(\mathcal{R}_I - \tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R}_I)\right) + E_I \tag{3.16}$$

where as before $I_f = \frac{1}{4} \int_0^\pi (f(r', \varphi) + f(r'', \varphi)) \sin^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \varphi \, d\varphi$. Recalling that the truncation depends on δ and n, we will prove the following estimate on the error term in Section 5:

Lemma 15. *For some $\epsilon > 0$ and some constant $C > 0$,*

$$E_I(x) \leq C\delta^{-1}\|f\|_\infty(\mathcal{R}_I - \tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R}_I))^{1-\epsilon}.$$

Approximating the measure of M^I as $\mathcal{O}(1/n)$ using Lemma 3 part (7), we then have that

$$\text{Var}(E_I) \leq \mathcal{O}(n^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1-\epsilon})\|f\|_\infty^2\delta^{-2}$$

and by Proposition 10 and Lemma 15, for $k \geq 1$,

$$\text{Cov}(E_I, E_I \circ F^k) \leq \mathcal{O}(n^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-1-\epsilon})\|f\|_\infty^2\delta^{-2}\theta^k.$$

Thus, for all n,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}(S_nE_I) &\leq 2\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(n-k)\text{Cov}(E_I, E_I \circ F^k)\\ &\leq C\|f\|_\infty^2\delta^{-2}n^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-\epsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

We therefore have that,

$$\frac{S_nE_I}{\sqrt[\alpha]{n}} \to 0 \tag{3.17}$$

in L_2, as $n \to \infty$.

Combining (3.17) with (3.16), we have that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\frac{\tilde{f}_I \circ F^k(x)}{\sqrt[\alpha]{n}} = \lim_{n\to\infty} I_f \sum_{k=1}^{n}\frac{\mathcal{R}_I \circ F^k(x) - \tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R}_I)}{\sqrt[\alpha]{n}}.$$

The limit on the right side was found in Subsection 2.4, thus we have that

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\frac{\tilde{f}_I \circ F^k(x)}{\sqrt[\alpha]{n}} = S_{\alpha,\tilde{\sigma}_f}$$

with $\tilde{\sigma}_f = I_f\tilde{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R}}$.

4 Proof of Theorem 1

In this section we prove that Theorem 1 follows from Theorem 9. For this we will utilize process convergence in the space of cadlag functions, $D([0,2])$.

Recall that $\tilde{f}_I$ is defined in terms of δ. We do not assume $\tilde{\mu}(f_I) = 0$ here. The first thing to notice is that for each fixed $\delta > 0$, we have that

$$\left(n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}S_{[nt]}\tilde{f}_I, t \in [0,2]\right)$$

converges in Skorokhod's J_1 topology as $n \to \infty$ to a compound Poisson process, i.e., a Lévy process with characteristic exponent (2.22) (see [Bil99] for a discussion of the J_1 topology and [Kyp06] for a discussion of Lévy processes). This follows because, for $\delta > 0$, the intensity measure of the limiting Poisson point process is finite:

$$\int_{\delta}^{1/\delta} x^{-1-\alpha}\, dx < \infty. \tag{4.1}$$

Therefore, there are a bounded (in distribution) number of nonzero terms in the summation. In other words, there is a random variable X such that the number of nonzero terms in $S_{[nt]}\tilde{f}_I$ is stochastically bounded by X for all n.

This implies that the centered sums

$$\left(n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} S_{[nt]}(\tilde{f}_I - \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_I)), t \in [0,2]\right) \tag{4.2}$$

also converge in the J_1 topology.

Next, let $\mathcal{N}(n,x)$ be the function which counts the number of returns to M up to time n, with respect to the map T, starting from $x \in M$. By the Ergodic Theorem,

$$\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R})\frac{\mathcal{N}(n,x)}{n} \to 1$$

as $n \to \infty$ for $\tilde{\mu}$-a.s. $x \in M$. Therefore, the following sequence of functions over the time interval $t \in [0,2]$ converges in $C([0,2])$ in the uniform topology:

$$y_n(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathcal{N}(n,x)\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R})}{n} t, \ t \in [0,1] \\ 2 + \left(2 - \frac{\mathcal{N}(n,x)\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R})}{n}\right)(t-2), \ t \in [1,2]. \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

The sequence (y_n) in fact converges to the identity function, and it is not difficult to see that the composition map $(x,y) \to x \circ y$ is continuous from $D([0,2]) \times C([0,2])$ to $D([0,2])$.

By the Continuous Mapping Theorem we obtain that for each fixed $\delta > 0$, the limiting normalized sums

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} (\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R})\mathcal{N})^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \left(S_{[\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R})\mathcal{N}t]}(\tilde{f}_I - \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_I))\right) \tag{4.4}$$

converge in J_1, where $t \in [0,2]$, to the same limit as that of (4.2) (noting in particular, that $\mathcal{N}(n,x) \to \infty$ a.s. at a rate similar to $n \to \infty$). Similarly since

$$\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R})\frac{\mathcal{N}(n,x)+1}{n} \to 1$$

as $n \to \infty$ for $\tilde{\mu}$-a.s. $x \in M$, we can conclude that (4.4) with $\mathcal{N}+1$ replacing $\mathcal{N}$ also converges to the same limit as that of (4.2). Moreover, the same convergence holds for any $\mathcal{N}'([nt],x)$ between $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{N}+1$.

To complete the proof, we simply consider the marginal distribution at $t = 1/\tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R}) = \mu(M) \in (0,1)$ and then follow the discussion after (2.23) which allows us to take the limit as $\delta \to 0$. This gives us that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{S_{\mathcal{N}} \tilde{f}}{\mathcal{N}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathcal{S}_n f}{\mathcal{N}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \frac{\mathcal{N}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}{(\mu(M)n)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \tag{4.5}$$

converges in distribution to $S_{\alpha,\tilde{\sigma}}$.

Remark: One might correctly suspect that a proper modification of (4.3) would prove convergence of (4.4) in J_1. Note however, that this would correspond to the truncated function $\tilde{f}_I$ for $\delta > 0$. In order to obtain convergence in J_1 for the full normalized summation, one is required to show

$$\left([\mathcal{N}t]^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} S_{[\mathcal{N}t]}(\tilde{f}_L - \tilde{\mu}(\tilde{f}_L)), t \in [0,2] \right)$$

converges to the 0 process in J_1 which is presumably much more difficult.

5 Proof of Lemmas 4 and 15: calculating the scale parameter

Here we calculate the parameter

$$\tilde{\sigma}_f^\alpha := \lim_{n\to\infty} n\varepsilon^\alpha \tilde{\mu}\left(|\tilde{f}| > \varepsilon\, n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \right) = \frac{2I_f^\alpha}{\beta\mu(M)|\partial Q|} \tag{5.1}$$

which easily implies

$$\sigma_f = \left(\mu(M)\tilde{\sigma}_f^\alpha\right)^{1/\alpha}.$$

We start with the special case of the return time function where $I_f = \bar{a}$ as is (2.5).

Proof of Lemma 4. Note that M consists of all collisions on $\partial Q \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2)$, thus the measure of M satisfies

$$\mu(M) = \frac{1}{2|\partial Q|} \int_0^{|\partial Q| - |\Gamma_1| - |\Gamma_2|} \int_0^\pi \sin\varphi \, d\varphi \, dr = \frac{|\partial Q| - |\Gamma_1| - |\Gamma_2|}{|\partial Q|}$$

To estimate the constant $\bar{a}$ in (2.5), we need to estimate the measure of the set $\{\mathcal{R} \geq n\}$ as a subset in $\mathcal{M}$; although $\mathcal{R}(x)$ is originally defined on M, it can be extended to the entire space $\mathcal{M}$ as the first hitting time function. Recall that we denote $F^n x = (r_n, \varphi_n)$. Lemma 3 and (2.4) imply that for any $n \in [1, \cdots, N_2]$, s_n and φ_n have the following relation:

$$s_n^{\beta-1} \sim \frac{\varphi_n}{n} \tag{5.2}$$

According to [Zha16, Proposition 2 part (6)], we know that for N large enough and for any $x \in M_N$, the following sequence is almost constant for $n = 1, \dots, N$:

$$H_n := s_n^\beta \sin\varphi_n = C_N + \mathcal{O}(s_n^{2\beta-1}) \tag{5.3}$$

where $C_N = c_h N^{-\alpha}$ is a constant which depends only on N, and $c_h > 0$ is a constant.

In order to estimate c_h, we use an elliptic integral and introduce

$$v_n := \int_0^{\varphi_n} (\sin u)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}\, du,$$

for $n = 1, \dots, N_2$ with N_2 as in Lemma 3 and where φ_n is increasing in n. Then

$$v_{n+1} - v_n = \int_{\varphi_n}^{\varphi_{n+1}} (\sin u)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}\, du = (\sin\varphi_n^*)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}(\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n) \tag{5.4}$$

for some $\varphi_n^* \in [\varphi_n, \varphi_{n+1}]$. By (5.3) we have,

$$\sin\varphi_n = \frac{H_n}{s_n^\beta}. \tag{5.5}$$

By (3.3) in [Zha16] and then by (3.7) and the equation following (3.21) in the same paper,

$$\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_n = s_n^{\beta-1} + s_{n+1}^{\beta-1} = 2s_n^{\beta-1} + \mathcal{O}\left(s_n^{\beta-1}/n\right). \tag{5.6}$$

Now combining the above and recalling that $\alpha = \beta/(\beta-1)$, we rewrite (5.4) as

$$v_{n+1} - v_n = 2H_n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + \mathcal{O}(N^{-1}n^{-1}). \tag{5.7}$$

Recalling (5.3), if we use a dummy variable and sum (5.7) from 1 to n, we get

$$v_n = 2nH_n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + \mathcal{O}(N\ln n) = 2nC_N^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + \mathcal{O}(\ln n/N) + \mathcal{O}(s_n^{2\beta-1}N^{\alpha-1}). \tag{5.8}$$

In particular, for $n = N_2 = N/2 + \mathcal{O}(1)$ we get

$$\int_0^{\pi/2} (\sin u)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}\, du = NC_N^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + \mathcal{O}(\ln N/N).$$

Thus

$$c_h = \left(\int_0^{\pi/2} (\sin u)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}\, du\right)^\alpha + \mathcal{O}(\ln N/N) = \bar{a}^\alpha + \mathcal{O}(\ln N/N). \tag{5.9}$$

The above implies that the set $\cup_{n=1}^{N-1} T^n M_N \subset \mathcal{M}$ is bounded by the line $r = r'$ (or $r = r''$), $\varphi = 0$, $\varphi = \pi$ and a curve described implicitly by the equation

$$r^\beta = \frac{C_N}{\sin\varphi}(1 + \mathcal{O}(r^{2\beta-1}C_N^{-1})) \tag{5.10}$$

or equivalently, using a Taylor expansion on the βth root of the second factor on the right,

$$r = \frac{C_N^{\frac{1}{\beta}}}{\sin^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \varphi} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{r^{2\beta-1}}{C_N^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}} \sin^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \varphi} \right).$$

Using the above the calculate the tail of the return time function, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(x \in \mathcal{M} \,:\, \mathcal{R} \geq N) &= \sum_{m \geq N} \sum_{k=0}^{m-N} \mu(T^k M_m) \\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{m \geq N} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \mu(T^k M_m) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-\alpha}) \\
&= \frac{2}{2\alpha |\partial Q|} \int_0^\pi \left(\frac{C_N^{\frac{1}{\beta}}}{\sqrt[\beta]{\sin \varphi}} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{r^{2\beta-1}}{C_N^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}} \sin^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \varphi} \right) \right) \sin \varphi \, d\varphi + \mathcal{O}(N^{-\alpha}) \\
&= \frac{C_N^{\frac{1}{\beta}}}{\alpha |\partial Q|} \int_0^\pi (\sin \varphi)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}} \, d\varphi + \mathcal{O}(N^{-\frac{\beta(3\beta-2)}{(\beta-1)(2\beta-1)}} + N^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}}) \\
&= \frac{2\bar{a} C_N^{\frac{1}{\beta}}}{\alpha |\partial Q|} + \mathcal{O}(N^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}}) \qquad (5.11)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (5.10) to estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{\pi/2} \frac{r^{2\beta-1}}{C_N^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}} \sin^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \varphi} \sin \varphi \, d\varphi &= \int_0^{\pi/2} \frac{r^{2\beta-1} \sin^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}} \varphi}{C_N^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}} \, d\varphi \\
&= \int_0^{\pi/2} r^{3\beta-2} \, d\varphi = \mathcal{O}(N^{-\frac{\beta(3\beta-2)}{(\beta-1)(2\beta-1)}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Now combining (5.11) with (5.9) and the definition of C_N, we get

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} N^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \mu(x \in \mathcal{M} \,:\, \mathcal{R} \geq N) = \frac{2\bar{a}^\alpha}{\alpha |\partial Q|}.$$

Using the fact that

$$\mu(x \in \mathcal{M} \,:\, \mathcal{R} \geq N) = \sum_{m \geq N} \mu(x \in M \,:\, \mathcal{R} \geq m) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-\alpha})$$

and the fact that $\frac{1}{\beta-1} = \alpha - 1$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{N \to \infty} N^\alpha \tilde{\mu}(x \in M \,:\, \mathcal{R} \geq N) &= \frac{2\bar{a}^\alpha}{\alpha(\beta-1)\mu(M)|\partial Q|} \\
&= \frac{2\bar{a}^\alpha}{\beta \mu(M) |\partial Q|}. \qquad (5.12)
\end{aligned}$$

This allow us to calculate

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\alpha} = \lim_{N\to\infty} N\tilde{\mu}\left(\mathcal{R} > N^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\right) = \frac{2\bar{a}^{\alpha}}{\beta\mu(M)|\partial Q|}.$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 4. □

In order to extend the calculation of the scale parameter to general $\tilde{f}$, we need to prove the error bound in Lemma 15.

Proof of Lemma 15. Consider any γ-Hölder continuous function f on $\mathcal{M}$, such that its induced function satisfies $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{H}_{\gamma}$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 4 write

$$v = \Psi(\varphi) := \int_0^{\varphi} (\sin u)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\, du,$$

where we have set the variable v equal to the function $\Psi(\varphi)$ since want to use $\varphi = \Psi^{-1}(v)$. In particular,

$$\frac{d\Psi^{-1}(v)}{dv} = (\sin\varphi)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}. \tag{5.13}$$

By (5.5),

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\Psi^{-1}(v_n)}{dv} &= (\sin\varphi_n)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \\
&= \left(\frac{H_n}{s_n^{\beta}} + \mathcal{O}(s_n^{\beta-1})\right)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \\
&= \frac{s_n^{\beta-1}}{H_n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}\left(1+\mathcal{O}(s_n^{2\beta-1})\right)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} = \frac{s_n^{\beta-1}}{H_n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}\left(1+\mathcal{O}(s_n^{2\beta-1})\right) \\
&= \frac{s_n^{\beta-1}}{H_n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} + \mathcal{O}(s_n^{3\beta-2}H_n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}})
\end{aligned}$$

thus using (5.7), we know that

$$|\Psi^{-1}(v_{n+1}) - \Psi^{-1}(v_n)| \le 3s_n^{\beta-1} \tag{5.14}$$

Combining (5.9) with (5.8) gives

$$v_n = \frac{2n\bar{a}}{N} + \mathcal{O}(\ln n/N).$$

By the Mean Value Theorem, there exists φ_* lying between $\Psi^{-1}(v_n)$ and $\Psi^{-1}(v_{n+1})$ such that

$$\Psi^{-1}(v_n) - \Psi^{-1}(v_{n+1}) = (\sin\varphi_*)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}(v_n - v_{n+1})$$

thus there exists φ_* which lies between φ_{n-1} and φ_{n+1} such that

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_n &= \Psi^{-1}\left(2n\bar{a}/N + \mathcal{O}(\ln n/N)\right)\\ &= \Psi^{-1}(2\bar{a}n/N) + (\sin\varphi_*)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}\mathcal{O}(\ln n/N)\\ &= \Psi^{-1}(2\bar{a}n/N) + \mathcal{O}(s_n^{\beta-1}\ln n)\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

We estimate the sum $\mathcal{S}_{N_2} := \sum_{n=1}^{N_2} f(r_n,\varphi_n)$. Note that collisions with the curves Γ_1 and Γ_2 alternate. Thus it is convenient to introduce $\bar{f}(\varphi) = (f(r',\varphi)+f(r'',-\varphi))/2$ where r', r'' are as in (1.2). Also, recall that the function f is Hölder continuous with exponent γ in the variables (r,φ). Thus we have

$$f(r,\Psi^{-1}(v_{n+1})) - f(r,\Psi^{-1}(v_n)) \le \|f\|_\gamma |\Psi^{-1}(v_{n+1}) - \Psi^{-1}(v_n)|^\gamma \le C\|f\|_\gamma s_n^{(\beta-1)\gamma}.$$

Moreover, if r_n is based on the same boundary as r', noting that $s_n = |r_n - r'| + \mathcal{O}(|r_n - r'|^2)$, then using (5.6), we get

$$|f(r_n,\varphi_n) - f(r',\varphi_n)| \le C\|f\|_\gamma s_n^{\gamma(\beta-1)}. \tag{5.16}$$

Recall that

$$I_f = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^\pi \bar{f}(\varphi)(\sin\varphi)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}\,d\varphi.$$

Using Lemma 3, (5.14), (5.15), and (5.16) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_{N_2}f &= \sum_{n=1}^{N_2}(f(r_n,\varphi_n))\\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{N_2}\frac{f(r',\varphi_n)+f(r'',-\varphi_n)}{2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N_2} s_n^\gamma\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N_2} s_n^{(\beta-1)\gamma}(\ln n)^\gamma\right)\\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{N_2}\frac{f(r',\varphi_n)+f(r'',-\varphi_n)}{2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N_2} s_n^\gamma\right)\\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{N_2}\bar{f}(\varphi_n) + \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N_2}(nN^\alpha)^{-\frac{\gamma}{(\alpha+1)(\beta-1)}}\right)\\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{N_2}\left(\bar{f}(\Psi^{-1}(2\bar{a}n/N)) + \mathcal{O}(N^{\frac{2\gamma}{\alpha+1}}n^{-(1+\frac{2}{\alpha+1})\gamma})\right) + \mathcal{O}(N^{1-\frac{\gamma}{\beta-1}})\\ &= \frac{N}{2\bar{a}}\int_0^{\bar{a}}\bar{f}(\Psi^{-1}(v))\,dv + \mathcal{O}(N^{1-\gamma}) + \mathcal{O}(N^{1-\frac{\gamma}{\beta-1}})\\ &= \frac{N}{2\bar{a}}\int_0^{\pi/2}\bar{f}(\varphi)\cdot(\sin\varphi)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}\,d\varphi + \mathcal{O}(N^{1-\frac{\gamma}{\beta-1}})\\ &= \frac{NI_f}{2\bar{a}} + \mathcal{O}(N^{1-\frac{\gamma}{\beta-1}}).\end{aligned}$$

By time reversibility, the trajectory going out of the cusp during the period $N_2 \le n \le N$ has similar properties. Thus

$$\sum_{n=N_2+1}^{N} f(r_n, \varphi_n) = \frac{N-N_2}{2\bar{a}} \int_{\pi/2}^{\pi} \bar{f}(\varphi) \cdot (\sin\varphi)^{1-\frac{1}{\beta}}\, d\varphi + \mathcal{O}(N^{1-\frac{\gamma}{\beta-1}}) = \frac{NI_f}{2\bar{a}} + \mathcal{O}(N^{1-\frac{\gamma}{\beta-1}}).$$

Therefore we can get the following estimation on the sum for $x \in M_N$,

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \left(\frac{I_f}{\bar{a}}\right)(\mathcal{R}(x) - \tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R})) + E(x)$$

where for some $C > 0$

$$|E(x)| \le C|\mathcal{R}(x) - \tilde{\mu}(\mathcal{R})|^{1-\frac{\gamma}{\beta-1}}.$$

□

Acknowledgements

The research of H. Zhang was supported in part by NSF CAREER grant DMS-1151762, and also in part by a grant from the Simons Foundation (337646, HZ). The research of P. Jung was supported in part by NSA grant H98230-14-1-0144. We would like to thank Dmitry Dolgopyat for posing the questions and also suggesting the main results discussed in this paper, i.e., the emergence of stable laws in billiard systems exhibiting slow decay of correlations. H. Zhang also thanks him for many invaluable discussions and suggestions.

References

[Adl78] Robert J Adler. Weak convergence results for extremal processes generated by dependent random variables. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 660–667, 1978.

[Ber27] Serge Bernstein. Sur l'extension du théorème limite du calcul des probabilités aux sommes de quantités dépendantes. *Mathematische Annalen*, 97(1):1–59, 1927.

[Bil99] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of Probability Measures*. Wiley, New York, 1999.

[CD09] Nikolai Chernov and Dmitry Dolgopyat. *Brownian Brownian motion-I*. American Mathematical Soc., 2009.

[CM07] N Chernov and R Markarian. Dispersing billiards with cusps: slow decay of correlations. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 270(3):727–758, 2007.

[CZ05] Nikolai Chernov and Hong-Kun Zhang. Billiards with polynomial mixing rates. *Nonlinearity*, 18(4):1527, 2005.

[CZ09] Nikolai Chernov and Hong-Kun Zhang. On statistical properties of hyperbolic systems with singularities. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 136(4):615–642, 2009.

[Dur10] R. Durrett. *Probability: theory and examples*. Cambridge Univ Pr, 2010.

[IL71] I.A. Ibragimov and Y.V. Linnik. Independent and stationary sequences of random variables. 1971.

[Kal73] Olav Kallenberg. Characterization and convergence of random measures and point processes. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 27(1):9–21, 1973.

[Kal02] Olav Kallenberg. *Foundations of modern probability*. Springer, 2002.

[Kyp06] Andreas E. Kyprianou. *Introductory lectures on fluctuations of Lévy processes with applications*. Springer, 2006.

[LLR83] M Ross Leadbetter, Georg Lindgren, and Holger Rootzén. Extremes and related properties of random sequences and processes. *Springer Series in Statistics*, 1983.

[Mar04] Roberto Markarian. Billiards with polynomial decay of correlations. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 24(01):177–197, 2004.

[ST94] G. Samorodnitsky and M.S. Taqqu. *Stable non-Gaussian random processes: stochastic models with infinite variance*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 1994.

[Zha16] Hong-Kun Zhang. Decay of correlations for billiards with flat points II: cusps effect. *Preprint*, 2016.